INFORMATION SHEET

DETERMINATIONS OF NO JURISDICTION FOR ISOLATED, NON-NAVIGABLE, INTRA-STATE WATERS RESULTING FROM U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION IN SOLID WASTE AGENCY OF NORTHERN COOK COUNTY V. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

| DISTRICT OFFICE: FILE NUMBER: | | | _ | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| REGULATORY PROJECT | Γ MANAGE | CR: | _ | _Jonathan | Smith | | Date: _9 | | |
| PROJECT REVIEW/DETE | ERMINATI | ON COM | IPLETED | | the office Y the project s | | Date: 24 | | |
| PROJECT LOCATION IN | FORMATION | ON: | | | | | | | |
| State: | | | | | | WA | | | |
| County: | County:King | | | | | | | | |
| Center coordinate | s of site by l | atitude & | longitudi | inal coordi | nates: | 47 20 1 | 2.5 122 10 | - | |
| Approximate size | | | | | | | | | |
| Name of waterway | | | anne upic | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | Soos Ci | •eek | | |
| ranie or water way | , 52 | | | | | 2305 61 | | | |
| SITE CONDITIONS: | | | | | | | | | |
| Type of aquatic resource ¹ | 0-1 ac | 1-3 ac | 3-5 ac | 5-10 ac | 10-25 ac | 25-50 ac | > 50 ac | Linear feet | Unknown |
| Lake | | | | | | | | | |
| River | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream | | | | | | | | | |
| Dry Wash | | | | | | | | | |
| Mudflat | | | | | | | | | |
| Sandflat | | | | | | | | | |
| Wetlands | | X | | | | | | | |
| Slough | | | | | | | | | |
| Prairie pothole | | | | | | | | | |
| Wet meadow | | | | | | | | | |
| Playa lake | | | | | | | | | |
| Vernal pool | | | | | | | | | |
| Natural pond | | | | | | | | | |
| Other water (identify type) | _ | | | | | | | | |
| ¹ Check appropriate boxes that | | | lated, non- | navigable, ii | ntra-state wat | ter present a | nd best estim | ate for size of | non- |

| | If Known | | If Unknown | | | |
|-----|----------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Use Best Professional Judgment | | | | |
| Yes | No | Predicted | Not Expected to | Not Able To Make | | |
| | | to Occur | Occur | Determination | | |
| X | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | X | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | X | | | | | |
| | X | | | | | |
| | X | X X X | Yes No Predicted to Occur X X X X X | Yes No Predicted to Occur Occur X | | |

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe potential for applicability of the Migratory Bird Rule to apply to onsite, non-jurisdictional, isolated, non-navigable, intra-state aquatic resource area.

TYPE OF DETERMINATION:

Preliminary __ Or Approved X

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING NJD (e.g., paragraph 1 – site conditions; paragraphs 2-3 – rationale used to determine NJD, including information reviewed to assess potential navigation or interstate commerce connections; and paragraph 4 – site information on waters of the U.S. occurring onsite) The Corps cannot take jurisdiction over the depicted wetland because it is isolated. Per the agent's observations, there is no surface water connection to waters of the U.S. There are no natural or man-made conveyance features present that provide hydrologic outfall from the wetland, and it appears that the hydrology from the wetland infiltrates at the southern (downslope) boundary of the wetland. The nearest surface water body is 1,200 feet away. USGS topographic maps and the topographic surveys of the applicant's project area show the area to be relatively flat. Consequently, it is unlikely that there is ever an overland surface water connection between the on-site wetland and the nearest jurisdictional waterbody. Agent has a history of making reliable field observations.